

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-19 and 21-27 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 19, and 21 have been amended. Claims 6, 16 and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 21-27 have been allowed. Reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

In the December 1, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 4 and 14, stating that there is no express mention that the treated silica reinforcer by itself must meet the requirement of a refractive index of at least 1.46. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the paragraph starting on page 15, line 2 of the current specification, it is disclosed that it is preferred “that the refractive index of the silica reinforcer is within about 0.015 of the corresponding refractive index of the silicone polymer. . . . The present treatment *of the silicone reinforcer* is directed to increasing *its refractive index about 1.46*, for example to about 1.46 or higher or even to about 1.5 or higher.” (emphasis added). Also, in the paragraph beginning at page 4, line 30 of the specification, it is disclosed that the silica reinforcer have a refractive index of above about 1.46. Thus, the specification specifically mentions a silica reinforcer with a refractive index of at least 1.46. The Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner also stated that the word “one” should be inserted into claims 1 and 11 right before the first mention of an aryl group. The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 11 as suggested. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner stated that the phrase “multiple bond” in each of claims 10, 20, and 21 should be replaced with “carbon-carbon double bond” for added clarity. The Applicant has amended each instance of the phrase “multiple bond” to read “carbon-carbon multiple bond.” (The limitation of claim 20 including this phrase is now included in claim 11). Because there are instances in which a monovalent hydrocarbon radical, or substituted monovalent hydrocarbon radical, would have a carbon-carbon multiple bond that is not a double bond, for example a carbon-carbon triple bond, amending the phrase to read “carbon-carbon double bond” would not merely be a clarifying amendment. It would also change the scope of the claim. The Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the meaning and scope of a “carbon-carbon multiple bond.” Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to claims 6 and 16 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 3 and 13 respectively. The Applicant has canceled claims 6 and 16 and respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 9, stating that it is indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that there is no antecedent basis in claim 3 for the moieties recited in claim 9. Claim 9 has been amended to depend from claim 8. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 11-13 and 15-19 based on Kennan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,008,305 and claims 11-12, 14 and 17-19 based on Suzuki, U.S. Patent No. 4,560,711. The Examiner noted that claim 20 was allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 20 and to correct a dependency error in claim 20. Because claim 20 is allowable, the dependent claims 11-15 and 17-29 should also be allowable. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicant believes that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. This paper is being filed with a request for a one-month extension, with requisite fee. Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 161805. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP


CAROLINE L. KELLER
Reg. No. 50491

Date: March 31, 2005
725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
(213) 488-7100